

REMARKS

Claims 51, 54, 81 and 82 are presently under consideration in the application. Claim 51 has been further amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIM 51 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 51 remains rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Maeda et al.* in view of *Hasegawa et al.* and *Eichenlaub*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants previously argued how *Maeda et al.* does not teach or suggest the rear substrate being provided with the partially reflective mirror as recited in claim 1. However, the Examiner responded by taking the position that Fig. 23 of *Maeda et al.* teaches the rear substrate 12 provided with the partially reflective mirror 220 as claimed. (O.A., p. 3).

In order to clarify better applicants' intended distinctions, claim 51 has been amended to recite that the rear substrate is provided with the partially reflective mirror in the sense that the "partially reflective mirror [is] located between the liquid crystal and [the] rear polarizer". As is exemplified in Fig. 12 of the present application, the partially reflective mirror is provided with the rear substrate 36. More particularly, *the partially reflective mirror is located between the liquid crystal 38 and the rear polariser 32.*

Maeda et al. does not teach or suggest the feature whereby the "partially reflective mirror [is] located between the liquid crystal and a rear polarizer ...", as recited in amended claim 51.

Referring to Fig. 23 of *Maeda et al.* (reproduced herein), the Examiner considers the polarized light separator 16 to represent the "rear polariser" recited in claim 51. From Fig. 23 of *Maeda et al.*, however, it is clear that the reflecting plate 220 is not located between the liquid crystal 13 and the "rear polariser" 16. Thus, the reflecting plate 220 in *Maeda et al.* does not represent a partially reflective mirror located between the liquid crystal and a rear polariser as recited in amended claim 51.

Furthermore, applicants note that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify the reflecting plate 220 in *Maeda et al.* to be in between the glass plate 12 and the polarized light separator 16 because doing so would render the device in *Maeda et al.* unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Hasegawa et al. and *Eichenlaub* do not make up for the deficiencies in *Maeda et al.* As a result, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 51.




Fig. 23

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 54 AND 81-82 UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 54 and 81-82 remain rejected under 35 USC §103(a) based on *Maeda et al.* in view of *Hasegawa et al.* and *Eichenlaub*, and further in view of *Handschy*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 54 and 81-82 each depend from claim 51, either directly or indirectly, and therefore may be distinguished over the teachings of *Maeda et al.* in view of *Hasegawa et al.* and *Eichenlaub* for at least the same reasons discussed above. Furthermore, *Handschy* does not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in the primary, secondary and tertiary references.

Consequently, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 51, 54 and 81-82 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/
Mark D. Saralino
Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: April 5, 2007

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

B:\GEN\YAMA\Yamap757\yamap757amendmentafterfinal4.wpd